

P284.
R 281

P284.07
R281h

REMARKS
ON SOME PORTIONS
OF THE
PASTORAL LETTER FOR LENT, 1853.
OF THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF HALIFAX.

BY A PROTESTANT.

The Jews of Berea are justly commended for their eagerly embracing the truth and searching the Scriptures, to find out the texts alleged by the Apostle; which was a far more generous proceeding than that of their country men at Thessalonica, who persecuted the preachers of the gospel, without examining the grounds they alleged for what they taught.—*Note in Douay Version on Acts xvii. 11.*

HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA:
PRINTED BY JAMES BARNES, 179 HOLLIS STREET.
1853.

R 281h

ON FORMER POINTS

211T 20

PASTORAL LETTER FOR LENT 1997

NOTE NO

ХАМАН ВО КОМПЛЕКТА СЛИОТНО ВЕМОТ

The laws of the country are not applied to the same extent as they are in the United States. The laws of the country are not applied to the same extent as they are in the United States. The laws of the country are not applied to the same extent as they are in the United States.

The
and se
was a
who p
leged

HAWKINS, JOHN, 1904-1905

PRINTED BY JAMES LIVING, 175 HOLBORN STREET.

2521

REMARKS
ON SOME PORTIONS
OF THE
PASTORAL LETTER FOR LENT, 1853.
OF THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF HALIFAX.

BY A PROTESTANT.

The Jews of Berea are justly commended for their eagerly embracing the truth and searching the Scriptures, to find out the texts alleged by the Apostle; which was a far more generous proceeding than that of their countrymen at Thessalonica, who persecuted the preachers of the gospel, without examining the grounds they alleged for what they taught.—*Note in Douay Version on Acts xvii. 11.*

HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA:
PRINTED BY JAMES BARNES, 179 HOLLIS STREET.
1853.

REMARKS

OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF THE LAND OFFICE

IN 1851

The Land Office of the State of South Carolina, under the direction of the Commissioner, has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of the report of the Commissioner of the Land Office of the State of Georgia, dated the 1st of January, 1851, and to state that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF THE LAND OFFICE

FOR THE YEAR 1851

1851

ROM

The
pastor
oppor
think
it is t
he be
evil.

Of
inculc
which
ble li
who
staver
grade
oppos
deave
rity o
selve
fills
with
the V
hope
Heav
We
woul
buffe
Be
tack
on th

REMARKS ON SOME PORTIONS
OF THE
PASTORAL LETTER FOR LENT, 1853,
OF THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF HALIFAX.
BY A PROTESTANT.

The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Halifax has lately published his yearly pastoral letter to his people, and for the good of "many" others "who have few opportunities of hearing any thing of Catholic Doctrine", and yet may, he thinks, read a printed document. Of course, if Dr. Walsh be on the right side it is to be hoped many will be led by his pages to embrace the true faith; if he be wrong it is necessary some antidote be sent out to prevent the possible evil.

Of the first half of his pamphlet we shall say nothing, as it is confined to an inculcation of moral duties, and to the defence of some doctrines of his Church which are not likely to do much harm even when thus set in the most favourable light. In the latter half, however, he passes from defence to attack on those who differ from him, dealing liberally in hard terms, and invective; makes statements, which we believe rash and unfounded, to exalt his Church and degrade Protestantism, and not contented with hostility to his fellow-men when opposed to his system, ventures against the sacred oracles themselves, and endeavours to depreciate the Word of God in order to set in its place the authority of his priesthood. We could bear much misrepresentation when we ourselves only are assailed, but it is assuredly not to be permitted that one who fills the place of a christian Teacher—an Archbishop of a Province—should, without at least a show of resistance, head a crusade against the Book which is the Voice of God to the Race, the fiery pillar to lead it by day and night: the hope of the wretched, the strength of the weary, the balm to the wounded, the Heavenly Hand that scatters blessings on our way in our path to Immortality. We lift up again the Bible he has thrown in the dust; we reverence it, as we would its Blessed Author, none the less, for being reviled, and spat upon and buffeted.

But let us turn to Dr. Walsh's pages and listen to the first notes of his attack: he begins at a distance, and only gradually comes to the direct assault on the Scriptures.

He introduces the subject under the guise of a defence of the "Holy Catholic Church" against the charge of "bating the Scriptures, of preferring human tradition to the inspired Word of God, and of having concealed it most carefully from the people until the Religious Revolution of the 16th century;" these are his own words: we shall see as we proceed in how far the alleged charges are just. Let me, however, deprecate the idea of entertaining any such views of the laity of Dr. Walsh's communion. With Roman Catholics as a people, I have not only no quarrel; I feel towards them the love of a brother and a friend. Nor do I accept the words in which Dr. Walsh states the indictment. I make no specific charge, but let the facts I shall bring forward make their own charges in the mind of the reader. Dr. Walsh's definition of our creed with regard to the standard of human faith, that it is "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," we accept and glory in. "Our painfully notorious disunion on every other point" I deny. Protestants are one on all the great truths of salvation—their differences are not those of principles by any means so much as of sinful human jealousy and passions, and even from this source they are not more disunited than the rival parties that have struggled within the Church of Rome have been in all ages. You cannot cut out a uniform for the mind. It cannot be drilled to a mechanical regularity of movement like the legs and arms of soldiers, and remain a mind. It must think—thinking is its life. Mind and thought are interchangeable terms.—Protestants, moreover, never get so far as is said of the Council of Trent in its discussion of the authority of Tradition, in which says Pallavicini: "there were almost as many opinions as there were heads"* Dr. Walsh will not dispute Pallavicini's authority. The silence of the muzzle is no sign of a universal peace among those who wear it.

Dr. Walsh's opening paragraph (page 27) is followed by a brief sketch of the history of the Canon of the sacred Scriptures (page 28), in which it is not easy to avoid a smile at the coolness with which assertions are made without the shadow of proof, and at the constant assumption of the Christian Church in the early ages being the same as the Roman Catholic Church of the present. The Church of Rome is not synonymous with the churches of the first centuries, nor is the Church of Rome now at all the same as the Church at Rome in the times of the Apostles. It differs alike in doctrine and practice. The proof lies on the surface of any book of ecclesiastical history.

Dr. Walsh tells us that it was the Church of Rome which "collected the sacred books and formed them into a Canon, and distinguished the true from the false, and the genuine and authentic from those which were spurious." We distinctly deny the assertion. The Canon of the Old Testament was fixed so far back as the days of Ezra, and has remained unaltered to the present day. It was received by Christ and his Apostles as we have it; it was the same in the days of Josephus as it is now. The Jews themselves have always received it as we have it. So that this part of the Bible which is the larger half, was received as the Bible before there was any church but the Jewish! As to the books of

* Quoted in Bungener's History of Council of Trent, 88.

the New Testament, the assertion is equally unfounded. We have more evidence for the genuineness and authenticity of the books which compose it, without going to the decrees or action of the church at all, than we have for those of any writings of the past.

The testimony of the early christian writers in every section of the church, and the recorded history of the practices of the churches in every part, are abundantly sufficient to settle the question. Were any thing wanting to complete the proof that we are not indebted to Dr. Walsh's church in this matter, it would be supplied by the fact that, at the Council of Trent, the Apocryphal books were sanctioned as canonical in the face of the testimony, negative and positive, of the Jews themselves, of the christian Fathers, including Jerome himself, the Author of the Vulgate Version, and by many authorities in the church, down to the time of the Council. So that so far from owing the Canon to the Church of Rome, we are forced to defend it from the Fathers and other sources, against her.

The Archbishop, when it serves his purpose, can write in a very different strain. In this passage it suits him to speak of the church as "carefully collecting" the sacred books, &c. &c—but in another place (84) when he wishes to run down these *sacred* writings, he changes his language wonderfully, and tells us that so far from the Church "carefully collecting" them, they were left "floating about the world for hundreds of years before they were collected together," (84). Certainly a strange difference of statement!

The Archbishop, of course, takes the credit to the Roman Church of all the martyrs who witnessed for the truth, but in doing so he forgets to prove what is very necessary in this matter, that the church with which any of these martyrs were connected was the same as that to which he belongs. The Unitarian Churches of New England might claim the Pilgrim Fathers as the illustrious confessors of their church, but with their present corruptions and departure from the faith of these venerable men, would any acknowledge their right to do so?

Passing to the origin of the Vulgate, the Archbishop introduces Jerome to us as the Latin Secretary of Pope Damasus. He forgets that for a hundred years after Damasus, the names Pope, Vicar of Christ, Chief Pastor and such like, which the Pope takes to himself now, were applied to other Bishops also.* So far was the Bishop of Rome then from being what he now is, as the Archbishop would insinuate. He omits, also, to tell, that after his two year's secretariat was ended by the death of Damasus, Jerome left Rome for the East, declaring that she was "Babylon" and the "purple" or, as we should say, scarlet "whore."† If this was right language, then what was Rome! if it was wrong language, then where is the unearthly sanctity of the Fathers?

The Archbishop passes a eulogium on the Vulgate, for which Jerome would, no doubt, thank him, were he now alive. Besides its usefulness in the past and its beauty, Dr. Walsh tells us as another feature of his commendation, that

* Gieseler's Eccles. History, I. 453.

† Neander's Ch. History, IV. 465.

"it has been since declared by a general council to be an authentic exposition of the meaning of the Holy Ghost." Who will say what is meant by this word "*authentic*," which is that employed in the Canons of the Council of Trent thus alluded to? Roman Catholic authors have differed as to its meaning—One thinks it means that the Vulgate is inspired—another that it is to be placed above the original texts in which the Bible was dictated by the Holy Ghost—some that it is infallible only so far as faith and morals are concerned—and some, again, that it is intended by the word "*authentic*" only to be placed above any other Latin version in use. Now, if there has been so much difference of opinion as to the meaning of a single word, of a single decree of an infallible council—and that, too, among the doctors of the church—what is the 'sense of the church' worth as an interpretation or judge of all Scripture and faith and practice? We shall surely need an explanation of the explanation. Does not this show how impossible it is to explain things so that only one right meaning shall be taught even to the humble and obedient?

Dr. Walsh passes on to eulogize the church for her 'faithful guardianship' of the Scriptures during the middle ages. We give all praise to the worthy and venerable men who, in these ages of darkness and corruption, valued the Scriptures. Some there were in the long intellectual night that hung over Europe who were still faithful; some who, in humble convents and in lonely parishes, and sometimes in the high posts of the church, still clung to the faith once delivered to the saints; but they were only a remnant like the seven thousand in Israel who had not bowed the knee to Baal. The copying of the Scriptures did not, however, come principally from them. The Benedictine Monks were the chief preservers of the Sacred and Profane Literature of the past, it being one of the rules of the order that they should thus copy books. It was their pride, and their business, in fulfilment of their necessary duties. Dr. Walsh's highly wrought sketch which makes these copyists such single-minded and enthusiastic Bible multipliers, is a mere flight of fancy. Some, no doubt, copied the Word because they loved it, but generally they transcribed their manuscripts "mechanically, as a monastic duty, and often with much incorrectness."* The books they transcribed so far from being exclusively, or chiefly the Scriptures, "were in a vast proportion such as we do not highly value at this day." "It was done in an ignorant and slovenly manner," says Hallam, speaking of the centuries preceding the Reformation. It is unfortunate for Dr. Walsh's assertion of the zeal of these brotherhoods, for multiplying the Scriptures "in every direction," that he has given no better illustration than that of their "most tastefully illuminating the sacred page with gold and colours, enshrining it in a covering of the most costly materials, and adorning it with gold and silver, with jewels and precious stones." This was not certainly the way to give the whole Bible or even a part of it, even to the "one in a thousand" who could read, nor like "spreading it in every direction." The truth is, copying was a trade as much as printing is now. If there had been a general desire for the spread of the Scriptures, cheap copies of parts of them might have been circulated to a

* Lit. of Europe, I. 97.

much
servic
thanks
Papap
The v
he, so
and D
was as
accomp
that he

Of "
a eulog
the alt
ages th
tion.
ception
a parti
pale li
ment e
sketch
the chu
the Bil
much a
the livi
mosphe
words—
Scriptu
for the
blesses

Dr.
centuri
would
thousan
copy of

As to
and Dr
himself
ages, at
be cons
theme
well as
Divided
lar mon

* Ha

much greater extent than they were. But we are in no mood to depreciate the services of these ' scribes ' in the dark times in which their lot was cast. All thanks to Benedict* and those who obeyed him or followed his example. To the Papacy, however, the world is certainly under no obligation in the matter.—The voice of Gregory the Great was the chief authority in the dark ages, and he, so far from encouraging such literary arts, or the studies of those " Fathers and Doctors of the Church " whom Dr. Walsh eulogizes in the next sentences, was as inveterate an enemy of learning as ever lived. Even such an ordinary accomplishment as good grammar he viewed with " superlative contempt " * So that here we have to be grateful not to the Church, but to individuals in it.

Of " the Saints, Fathers and Doctors " of those days, we have, as I have said, a eulogy. It is a gladdening truth, that the fire never altogether went out on the altar, even in the worst times. We rejoice for the sake of humanity in those ages that some of the salt of the earth was still left to prevent universal corruption. But both the piety and learning then were the exception—the feeble exception—to the general rule. Now in one country, now in another, there was a partial revival of Scriptural truth and intelligence. But it was only like the pale light of the aurora, shining now for a moment here, and again for a moment elsewhere on the face of the night. It is remarkable that in his whole sketch of these worthies—he, of course, including among them the teachers of the church as a whole, we, the few illustrious exceptions—Dr. Walsh speaks of the Bible only, as their study or instructor. The Church or Tradition is not so much as once mentioned by him. " The pure well of *undefiled revelation* was the living source and fountain of *all* their knowledge." " They lived in an atmosphere of the Bible; its precious truths were familiar to them as household words—the love of Scripture was interwoven with their very thoughts." If Scripture alone can make men so holy and so eminent, there is surely little left for the church to do. Why keep back from any what so greatly elevates and blesses?

Dr. Walsh frowns on the millions who, as he affirms, " ignorantly " call the centuries before the revival of learning ' dark ages ' Protestants at any rate, would call any ages dark, in which, as Dr. Walsh says of these, " not one in a thousand could read, and not one in twenty or even fifty thousand could get a copy of the whole Bible." (42).

As to the general state of the church in those ages of " Saints and Fathers and Doctors," I quote the following passage from Hallam, whom Dr. Walsh himself uses as an authority:—" The greater part of literature in the middle ages, at least from the twelfth century " (beginning, of course, A. D. 1100) " may be considered as artillery levelled against the clergy * * * * If there is one theme upon which the most serious as well as the lightest, the most orthodox as well as the most heretical writers are united, it is ecclesiastical corruption.—Divided among themselves, the secular clergy detested the regular; the regular monks satirized the mendicant friars; who in their turn, after exposing

* Hallam's Lit. Europe, I. 29, 142.

both to the illwill of the people, incurred a double portion of it themselves." * Contrast this with Dr. Walsh's picture of these times, in which he makes the church so holy—so diligent—busy only in copying or studying God's word.—Yet certainly Hallam is as faithful and learned a historian as Dr. Walsh.

From the middle ages the Archbishop comes to our own days, and gives us to understand that in the Roman Catholic system the Bible is first, midst and last. It is "the Text-Book and Manual of the Catholic Church." Her clergy "seven times in every day of their lives, are enjoined to repeat many portions"—many portions, seven times a day—the Bible must thus be read over and over in a very short time. But this, we presume, is not the meaning of the Archbishop. He, doubtless, refers to the requirement that each ecclesiastical person in his church shall repeat each day, in public or private, the whole service for the day contained in the Breviary, which, so far from being the whole Bible, consists of a few Psalms in Latin, a few chapters of the Old Testament, and a few fragments of the gospels and epistles, mixed up with an immense farago of legends of the Saints, tull of all sorts of incredible tales, wild adventures and ridiculous practices. Here, then, we have the kind of teaching the Church of Rome estimates most highly, and aims most to diffuse among her children.—Wonderful training for infallible interpreters! In speaking of the use of the Bible in the public worship of his church, the Archbishop conveniently forgets to tell us in how many cases it is a wholly unintelligible service to his people—a mere sound without sense—how often, I mean, it is read in an unknown tongue. Yet this was surely an important item.

Dr. Walsh now undertakes to prove that the Church of Rome has always been a friend to Bible circulation—much more so than Protestants. In support of this he adduces alleged facts. Let us premise a few things and then examine the statement.

Before the apprehension of danger from it, there was no need for the Church of Rome to withhold the Sacred Volume from the people. The doing so was one of the advances in corruption of which Protestants complain. As that corruption increased, however, so did the jealousy of the word of God, on the part of the church. As soon as it feared danger to its authority from the reading of the Scriptures, it strove to keep them back from the laity. Thus, for example, when those primitive Protestants—the Vaudois, were sought to be crushed, their principles having spread in various countries through the humble study of the Bible, the church decreed that the word of God should be taken from the people in order that this Reformation might be put down. The Council of Toulouse held in the year 1229 decreed, with this view, that "the laity were not to be allowed the books either of the Old or New Testaments." The Synod (Council) "most strictly prohibited" their having translations of the sacred books in the vulgar tongue.† The French version of this canon is as that "no laic shall have by him the books of the Old or New Testaments." Hagenbach mentions two other such prohibitions, one of Pope Innocent III. (A. D. 1199), and one in the year 1234, (Hist. of Doct. I. 441.) How does

* Hallam's Lit. of Europe, I. 185.

† Edgar's Variations of Popery, 250.

this ag
forbid
as it f
it rou
ly, as
one w
Bes
her p
the cl
begin
and d
der V
the ve
very
Let it
siring
circul
we ha
Roma
hibitio
dition
An
gin w
risen
thoug
He
havin
ed.
not a
ceive
ed th
not b
celebr
saw t
of the
ples
allow
unde
to co
like
ditio
the p
man
trans
ever
prin

this agree with the Archbishop's assertion that the church not only does not forbid but earnestly recommends the devout reading of the Bible? As soon as it fears danger from it, it seeks to take it away from the people or to hedge it round with such restrictions as to make nominal permission useless—or finally, as in the Archbishop's case, to run it down and make so little of it, that no one would care about seeing it.

Besides this fact that, as long as it is not used by the laity, the church lets her prohibitions, in a measure, sleep, let the statements as to the corruptions of the clergy which I quoted before from Hallam be remembered. Rome at the beginning of the century in which the Reformation took place was as sunken and depraved as it could be. Dr. Walsh will not, I presume, defend Alexander VI, than whom history knows few greater monsters of iniquity. When the very centre of the church was drenched in pollution, there could not be a very vigilant spiritual police to suppress every act of insubordination at once. Let it be remembered also that even in the church there were some who, desiring a return to primitive practice and purity, were anxious to spread the circulation of the Scriptures without reference to the will of their superiors, as we have seen in this century in the case of Leander Van Ess, an eminent Roman Catholic clergyman in Europe who, in spite of Papal rescripts and prohibitions, circulated more than one hundred thousand of the Bible Society's editions of the Scriptures.

And, still further, it is to be remembered that the Reformation did not begin with Luther; the storm long gathering only burst in his day; a cry had risen long before him for the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue. Keeping these thoughts in mind let us examine the Archbishop's statements.

He lays great stress on a German Bible having been printed in 1466, and having gone through "no less than 17 editions" before Luther's Bible appeared. But was it the Church of Rome which translated and printed it? Was it not a private speculation of the printer, which he ventured on from the perceived desire of many for a version in the vulgar tongue? It will be remarked that Dr. Walsh does not speak about its being published officially. He did not because he could not. Let us listen again to Dr. Walsh's authority "the celebrated Protestant historian" Hallam. The government of Europe early saw the danger, especially in such a country as Germany where "a deep sense of the corruptions of the church pervaded every class," and "where the principles that were to burst out in the Reformation were evidently germinating" of allowing a free religious press. They accordingly early appointed censorships under the superintendence of the clergy. The University of Cologne, perhaps to counteract the influence of previous translations, or perhaps from a spirit like that I have noticed in Leander Van Ess, sanctioned the printing of an edition in that city in 1479. But even after this the Church was ill at rest from the prevalence of God's word. In 1486 the Archbishop of Mentz published a mandate, formally threatening with excommunication, &c. "any person who translated, or circulated when translated, any books upon any subject whatever, from the Greek or Latin, or any other tongue, into German, until, before printing, and again before their sale, such translations shall be approved by

four doctors herein named." The zeal of the Church for the translation of the Scriptures into German, and the extent to which any edition they might put out would be made for the people, may be judged from the following estimate by the Archbishop in the same document, of the capabilities of German as a language into which to translate even human compositions, far less the inspired volume. "Can such men," (translators,) says he, "assert, that our German language is capable of expressing what great authors have written in Greek and Latin on the high mysteries of the Christian faith, and on general science.—Certainly it is not." If incapable of expressing general science and theology, what must the Archbishop have thought of it as the vehicle of expressing the revelation of God? Could he have been very anxious to diffuse a book so faulty as a German Bible must in his opinion have been? That the early editions of the Scriptures in German were not published by the Church, is sufficiently clear from the fact that Hallam tells us that it was on account of "religious translations, especially those of the Scripture, which had been very early printed in Germany, that this alarm was taken by the Archbishop."* What shall we say after this of Dr. Walsh boldly claiming these editions for the Roman Church?

As to the Latin Bible printed in 1455, mentioned by Dr. Walsh, page 31, he has no more right to claim it for his Church than he has to claim the paper on which it was printed. Its very existence was unknown till the middle of last century. It was a private venture of the discoverers of printing.

Dr. Walsh has a note on the printing of the Bible, which, as he seems to think his case very strong, we had better examine while on the point. "John Dietenberg," says he, "published a version under the auspices of the Archbishop Albert in 1534." Dr. W. must know that this edition was an utter failure—that it was intended to supersede Luther's, and was so ineffectual, that the edition which he next mentions, by Drs. Eck and Empser, had to be published in 1537 to take its place. If the Church of Rome do let "twenty editions" of a translation of the Scriptures be sold, as Dr. W. asserts of Dietenberg's, she should take care that it be a tolerably correct one. Is there any merit in giving versions when they are dragged out by those of the opposite party?

Italian versions come next. Dr. W. tells us that there were two Italian versions before Luther. The first, he says, was by Archbishop Voragine in 1290. But is Dr. W. not aware that it is questioned if it ever existed? It never was printed. It was the work of an individual, if it ever was executed, not of the Church. The second version was "by Malermi, a monk of Camaldoli, which was printed at Rome and Venice in 1471." Before 1525 he tells us "thirteen editions of this translation were published." But because it was the work of a monk was it therefore the work of the Church. Luther's books, and those of Zwingle and Melancthon, at that time were circulated extensively in Italy, does that prove that the Church printed or circulated them? As to Malermi's Bible let us judge from the case of Van Ess, and Borrow's friends in the

* Hist. Lit. I. 349.

priest
us that
the pri
Reform
voured
ed after
Office
of those
be easi

The
1532.
put it
sermon
into pr
of the
sion of
books
the Co
Dr. W
was on

As t
Walsh
ing the
1512, i
had to
a heret
the per
burned
Roman
and th
to get
who co

Lefe
gians
Fifth,
try to
the fac
sixth c

I pa
could,

* H
† H
‡ M
§ H
|| D
** P

translation of the
they might put
owing estimate
f German as a
less the inspired
at our German
n in Greek and
eral science.—
e and *theology*,
expressing the
fuse a book so
the early edi-
church, is suffi-
count of "reli-
een very early
hop."* What
s for the Ro-

sh, page 31, he
the paper on
middle of last

s he seems to
point. "John
of the Arch-
s an utter fai-
effectual, that
ad to be pub-
twenty editi-
of Dietem-
Is there any
the opposite

o Italian ver-
gine in 1290.
It never was
d, not of the
aldoli, which
us "thirteen
ne work of a
and those of
ly in Italy,
s to Maler-
friends in the

priesthood in Spain. So far from being put out by the Church, Hallam tells us that these editions were the result of the early and wide sowing in Italy of the principles of the Reformation.* They were continually reprinted for the Reformers, who were found in every considerable city of Italy, and were favoured, even there, in some parts, by those in power. Editions being sanctioned after 1525 by the Inquisition, as Dr. Walsh speaks of, means that the Holy Office had at last found it necessary to do something to counteract the efforts of those who held the new doctrines. What an inquisition edition means may be easily judged.

The next version Dr. Walsh mentions, is that of Bruccioli, printed at Venice, 1532. We certainly little thought Dr. Walsh would have boldness enough to put it among 'Catholic versions.' Bruccioli was the editor of the posthumous sermons of Savonarola who was burned as a heretic.† He was himself thrown into prison as a heretic, and escaped death only to be banished. His edition of the Bible was printed at Venice, a city which was a refuge from the oppression of the church, and which Paul V. accuses of allowing the publication of books that had been censured at Rome.‡ More than all, it was condemned by the Council of Trent, and was put in the first list of prohibited books. Should Dr. Walsh have placed this among Catholic versions? Marmochino's edition was only Bruccioli's retouched.§

As to the early editions in other languages, we may judge what right Dr. Walsh has to call them Catholic versions, from the facts already stated respecting the early German and Italian editions. Lefevre's translation published in 1512, is set down in Dr. Walsh's list. Now will it be believed that Lefevre had to flee from France, under a borrowed name, to escape condemnation as a heretic—that he belonged to a circle of reformers, some of whom fled before the persecution of the Romish Church, some were imprisoned, and some were burned alive? Will it be believed that this version paraded in this list as a Roman Catholic one was actually put on the list of prohibited books in France, and that having been refused permission in 1523 to print it in France he had to get it printed at Antwerp.¶ What would we say of a Protestant clergyman who could do as Dr. Walsh has done here?

Lefevre's version was "revised" says Dr. Walsh, "in 1551, by the Theologians of Louvain." He omits to say that they did it *by command of Charles Fifth*, and put it forth as a new Translation.** That they needed to do so to try to counteract the other translations that filled France, may be judged from the fact that about the time it appeared it was estimated that more than one sixth of the population of France had forsaken the Roman communion.

I pass the other French editions, Dr. Walsh mentions, on each of which I could say something. To make a remark on De Sacy's, which likewise he asserts

* Hallam's Lit. of Europe, I. 502.

† Hallam's Hist. of Lit. II. 507.

‡ McCrie's Reformation in Italy.

§ Hallam, I. 326. †† Savonarola was sentenced to be hanged, and then burned.

¶ D'Aubigne's Reformation, III. 460. Hallam, I. 529.

** Hallam Hist. Lit. I. 529.

among his Catholic versions. Will it be credited that this version was formally condemned by Popes Clement IX. and Innocent XI., and that it was made while the author was lying in jail on a charge of heresy? So much again for Dr. Walsh's list!

Let us turn now to Spain. "In 1405, Boniface Ferrer translated the whole Bible into the Valencian Dialect of Spanish. This was printed in 1478 and again in 1515, with the approbation of the Spanish Inquisition. Montesma published a version of the epistles and gospels in 1512, which was reprinted frequently after at Madrid, Barcelona, Antwerp, &c." The Archbishop forgets to tell that as faithful children of the church, Juan of Arragon had prohibited the use of any part of the Scriptures in the Vernacular in 1253, and that in the end of the 15th century Ferdinand and Isabella prohibited all, under the severest penalties, from translating the sacred Scripture into the vulgar tongues, or from using it when translated by others (McCrie's Reformation in Spain, 146). Boniface Ferrer, notwithstanding prohibitions, did translate the Bible as Dr. Walsh tells us, and it was printed in 1478, as he says. But he forgets to tell that though as usual it was printed at private expense—though it was the work of a Catholic—and though it underwent the examination and correction of the Inquisitor, James Borrell, it had scarcely made its appearance when it was suppressed by the Inquisition, who ordered the whole edition to be burned—As to its being reprinted in 1515 Dr. Walsh must know that its having been so is greatly questioned, and that if it was, it was immediately proscribed in the same manner. So totally had the whole book been destroyed that its ever having existed at all was proved only by the discovery, two hundred years after, of the four concluding leaves, in a Monastery, by which the name of the translator and printer, and place, and time of the impression were brought to light.

As to Dr. Walsh's notice of the epistles and gospels having been printed in 1512, it is worthy of notice that Enzinas, who published a translation of the Spanish Testament at Antwerp in 1548, for which he was thrown into prison at once, at Brussels, says in his preface to Chas. V, that one reason why he had undertaken the work was, that Spain had not as yet the Sacred Scriptures in its own tongue, and should have it.

Of the Flemish versions in Dr. Walsh's list I may state that Hallam, after reciting the various editions published in that language, says: "Most of these were taken from Luther, but some from the Vulgate."*

But there is one fact that speaks volumes. The first list of books *prohibited* by the church was published by Paul IV. in 1559. It includes all Bibles in modern languages, enumerating forty-eight editions, chiefly printed in Roman Catholic countries. And as if to mark the hatred of the papacy to free inquiry, sixty-one printers were by that list put under a general ban; all works of every description from their presses being forbidden †

The Archbishop's next pages are devoted to an attempt to write down the Bible, and make it appear almost worthless and wholly unnecessary. One could

* Hallam Hist. Lit. I. 328.

† Hallam Hist. Lit. II. 503

scarcely
a way o
sinuat
only fe
I am a
course
or drive
must ei
stable s
church
faith of
the aut
words n
thor" "
or doub
"they
sand y
Apocal
ground
against
myster
dictate
but so
"Both
househ
divine
style, v
subject
under
if Dr.
Great
know
that it
But
Christ
Christ
of it."
sinuat
them
on an
it had
how d
of it?
Why

was formally
it was made
uch again for

ted the whole
178 and again
ma published
d frequently
ets to tell that
ed the use of
n the end of
e severest pe-
gues, or from
n, 146). Bo-
Bible as Dr.
Forgets to tell
was the work
rection of the
when it was
be burned—
having been
scribed in the
t its ever hav-
years after,
e of the trans-
ught to light.
n printed in
slation of the
n into prison
ason why he
ed Scriptures

Hallam, after
Most of these

oks prohibited
all Bibles in
ed in Roman
o free inqui-
all works of

down the Bi-
One could

scarcely suppose it was a christian, far less an Archbishop, who speaks in such a way of the sacred books of our Faith. Where will he find a Protestant insinuate such suspicions respecting them, or speak so meanly of them. But he only follows the true Jesuit plan—down with the Bible—up with the church. I am surprised Dr. Walsh should have used such a questionable course—a course which must make men either lay aside reason and conviction in religion, or drive them into utter infidelity. If a man's faith in the Bible be shaken, he must either accept the church in a lump, or have nothing. Why venture unstable souls to the borders of atheism under pretence of leading them to the church? Was this the method of Christ and his apostles in drawing men to the faith of the gospel? Is there no way to exalt the church but by questioning the authority of Christ and the truth of the Scripture? But let us examine his words more closely. He tells us that "the Bible is not the book of one author" "but of thirty"—"some known"—some "respecting whom all is ignorance or doubt." That they were "of different nations, but principally Jews"—that "they wrote at different periods, and frequently at long intervals"—"two thousand years having intervened from the composition of Genesis to that of the Apocalypse," &c. Now, what is the object in telling us this? If, on these grounds, he doubts the divine authority of the Bible, it can be easily defended against him. If he would have us believe that it is on this account dark and mysterious, we would remind him that the same God who dictated the first of it dictated the last, and that, to use a metaphor of Pope Gregory, its authors were but so many different "pens" in the hand of the unchanging King of Kings.—"Both Testaments," says Irenæus, "hath one and the same master of the household produced, even our Lord Jesus Christ." And even apart from their divine origin it does not surely affect the simplicity and clearness of a man's style, when or where he was born, if he was commonly conversant with his subject and with the language in which he wrote, and was fit for the task he undertook. As to not knowing the authors of some of the books of Scripture, if Dr. Walsh see a difficulty in this, he differs from his master, Gregory the Great, to whom I have just referred, who tells us that it is not necessary to know the pen with which the King of Kings has written his royal letter, but that it suffices to have a full conviction of its divine contents.*

But "not one word" of the New Testament "was written during the life of Christ." How could it be when his death is its great subject and origin?—Christ, he says, "gave no advice, or command, or direction to write any part of it." Did they then write it against his will? If not, to what end this insinuation against it? Is it not the 'mind of Christ'? did he not directly inspire them to write it? And if so, is it not as much written by his "advice, direction and command," when the voice thus came from the excellent glory, as if it had been uttered while he was still in the form of a servant? But how does Dr. Walsh know that, because it is not recorded, Christ did not speak of it? Have we all that Christ said? Dr. Walsh's church especially, says no. Why stab at the Scriptures thus? Their inspiration is certified by overwhelm-

* Hagenbach, I. 323.

ing evidence. Their own contents furnish abundant proof. But again, "it is not recorded that Christ himself ever wrote" except once, "upon the ground, and even these few words have not been preserved." What has this to do with the point in hand? 'Jesus himself baptized not'—is there therefore to be no baptism? Is not his commission to his apostles to write by his giving them inspiration, sufficient? Had he been author as well as Saviour, would it have made the Scriptures any more his will than they are? But I leave it to the Archbishop to tell what Christ should have done, and rest contented with knowing what he has done. As to his having made no recorded allusion to writing the Scriptures when he gave his apostles their last commission, are we to say when Christ ought to have spoken of one thing and when of another? Is it not enough that he has spoken of each at the time he thought best? If he said both at any time are not both equally binding? And were there not 'many things' which Jesus had yet at his death to tell to the apostles, but which 'they could not bear' until 'the Spirit' had 'come' after his ascension, and taught them 'all truth.'—John xvi. 12.

The next assertion of the Archbishop is, that "when the apostles met together for the last time, and dispersed themselves throughout the world to fulfil their great commission, not one word of the New Covenant" that is, the New Testament, "was written." The last time the apostles met together is recorded in the 15th chapter of Acts, and is agreed by the best chronologies to have been A. D. 52, or nineteen years after Christ's ascension.* But St. Matthew's gospel was written, according to the great bulk of authorities† within, at the furthest, fifteen years of this great event and, in all probability, within eight.—So that it, at least, was in circulation for four years, and for most likely eleven, before the apostolic meeting took place. So much for Dr. Walsh's assertion! It was written in Syro Chaldaic, the language of the christians of Palestine, and was designed for their use; nor can any thing shew more convincingly how far God is from wishing us to trust to human tradition, than that, to preserve the truth uncorrupted, he caused, in addition to the Jewish Scriptures they already possessed, a written gospel to be sent thus early to the very people among whom Christ had lived and died, and the whole of the apostles had laboured.—That no other gospels or sacred writings of the New Testament were written earlier, is easily understood when we remember Dr. Walsh's own words, that the apostles met "before dispersing themselves throughout the world to fulfil their great commission". There were consequently as yet, we may say, no communities in the Gentile world to which they could be sent, the only pioneer tour that had then been made beyond Palestine having been that of St. Paul and Barnabas, recorded in the 13th and 14th chapters of Acts. But so far from its being the fact that "very many years" were allowed to elapse before the writing of the other parts of the New Testament, the same year in which the apostolic meeting took place, saw Paul's first epistle sent to the Thessalonians, whom he had visited shortly before in the missionary journey just referred to, and also, if it was not written even earlier, the epistle to the Galatians, while

* See the very full Chronological Tables in Olshausen.

† See Campbell, Bloomfield, Alexander on the Canon, and others.

the m
ing al
from
Gen
epistle
gospel
so wid
Paul's
John
writte
en wh
good m
layed

Th
was n
Old T
ality
on wh
has an
public
6) the
gave t
ing."
origin
the la
tone t
Chald
comm
and th
Scrip
ligion
use in
langu
it bein

Dr.
except
christ
Arch
them
we ha
intenc
direct
New
univer

* P

the next, gave the Thessalonians their second. And still further, notwithstanding all his mighty labours and constant journeying, within six or seven years from the first dispersion of the apostles, we may say, to *break ground* among the Gentiles, St. Paul had sent his epistle to the christians at Rome, and his two epistles to those at Corinth, and three or four years more at the latest, saw the gospels of Mark and Luke sent abroad among the churches. And so soon and so widely were the sacred books spread, that we find St. Peter referring to Paul's epistles as even in his day commonly known, (2 Pet. iii. 16), and St. John took care in his gospel to avoid repeating what the other evangelists had written, as even in his day unneeded. So little was there left for tradition even while the Holy Apostles were yet alive. Dr. Walsh, doubtless, could give good reasons were he asked, why the very last portions of revelation were delayed for a few years after the rest.

The next paragraph looks very like a wilful misrepresentation. We trust it was not so. He tells us that "the Hebrew in which the earlier portions of the Old Testament were written was a dead and unknown language to the generality of the Jews, after the Babylonish captivity, and yet it was the only version which was read in the synagogue even to the time of Christ". Dr. Walsh has an answer ready for him in Nehemiah, where it is said that at the great public reading of the law on the return of the people from Babylon (Neh. viii. 6) the appointed parties "read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense (that is, interpreted it) and caused them to understand the meaning." The Scriptures were indeed read in the synagogues of Palestine in the original Hebrew, but they were interpreted to the people by a proper officer in the language which had become vernacular. The reader spoke in a very low tone to the interpreter, who stood by his side and pronounced aloud in Syro Chaldaic (the language understood by the people) that which had thus been communicated to him.* In the notices of the synagogues in the life of Christ, and the labours of the apostles, we always find that the people understood the Scriptures, and could be appealed to respecting the proofs they gave of our religion. The Greek version of the Old Testament was also in very common use in Palestine in the time of Christ, many of the people understanding that language. In Egypt the services of the synagogue were conducted in Greek, it being the language used by the Jews in that country.

Dr. Walsh next tells us that the New Testament was "all written in Greek, except the gospel of St. Matthew, * * and yet countless thousands of the early christians knew nothing whatsoever of Greek or Hebrew." What does the Archbishop mean? How can he insult his people so greatly as to suppose them so ignorant as to be misled by such language? St. Matthew's gospel, as we have seen, was written in the language of the people of Palestine because intended for them first. It was translated by the apostle himself, or under his direction, into Greek, in which language we have it now, and the rest of the New Testament was written in Greek because that language was then almost universally understood. Cicero tells us that it was read in almost all nations,

* Pictorial Bible, Luke iv. 17. Nevin's Bib. Antiq. 411. R. Hall's works, V. 309.

and so it had been among the Jews. The New Testament then was written in the most widely spoken language of the world, that as many as possible might have it in their own tongue. Nor was even this provision for the wide diffusion of the Scriptures deemed enough. Dr. Walsh knows how soon versions were made into the languages of the comparatively few who did not know Greek. The Vulgate itself is partly taken from much older Latin translations, and the Old Syriac New Testament is thought by some of the best scholars to have been translated before the close of the first century. * The Septuagint, or Greek version of the Old Testament, Dr. Walsh knows, was made at least 150 years before Christ, that those of the Jews who spoke Greek might have the Bible in their own tongue.

"The Bible," says Dr. Walsh, "is a series of unconnected treatises, and on a vast variety of subjects; at one time prophetic, at another historical; now doctrinal and then poetic; a narrative, a code of morals, a genealogical tree, a natural history, a catalogue of names and numbers, a geography, a book of rites and ceremonies, an allegory, a mystery." A sad omnium gatherum according to Dr. Walsh. And is this what God has dignified with the name of a Revelation? Is a 'Geography' to be "incensed" and "kissed," and "surrounded with lighted candles"? Either the church in affecting to honour the Bible so much, or Dr. Walsh in speaking of it so lightly, must be wrong. But we indignantly deny that Dr. Walsh's description is true. It is a miserable, infidel-like, caricature. That church is surely wrong that would allow an Archbishop to speak thus of what he and it acknowledge to be the Revelation of our Maker to mankind. The Bible is not unconnected or aimless, or a mere bundle of scraps, else, if it be God's book, with whom lies the blame? The Bible is the history of the plan of salvation and its explanation by precept and illustration. Looked at steadily it will be found that all Dr. Walsh says respecting it—all the names he calls it—fall under a very few heads. But refutation of such slanders is beneath any one who still respects God's book. Very different is this language from that of Jerome, the author of the version authorized by the Roman Catholic Church. Writing to a lady on the education she should give her daughter, he says:—"Let her first learn the Psalter, and give her hours of leisure to these holy songs. From the Proverbs of Solomon she will gather practical instruction; Ecclesiastes will teach her to despise the world; in Job she will find examples of virtue and endurance. Then let her go to the gospels and never lay them down. The Acts of the Apostles, with the Epistles, must be imbibed with all the ardour of her heart. When her mind is thoroughly stored with these treasures, she may commit the Prophets to her memory," &c.† These are his words, and are surely of as much weight as those of Dr. Walsh. Would he have thus written if he had thought the Bible a 'Geography'—a 'genealogical tree'—or 'a catalogue of names and numbers'?

Dr. Walsh tells us (34) that St. Luke and St. Mark wrote only from "hearsay and the testimony of others." Luke tells us of himself that "he had perfect understanding of all things from the very first" (Luke i. 3). Dr. Walsh is

* Alexander on the Canon, 158.

† Kitto's Cyclo. Bib. Lit., I. 176.

perfectly
Mark u
ly chur
of any
of Dr. V
How far
value of
countri
general
same as
sacred
the epis
not the
cality, b
lar chur
verses)
Bible w
would a
not fitte
New Te
ently an
martyrs
liver inf
ed volun
that is,
they ha
confesso
ing the
fact is, i
est time
The I
ble," ad
opinion,
that was
was "pu
his fello
abstruse
ject. T
its vario
years.
make th
answer
Says Ch
quence),
Holy Sp
shepher

perfectly aware that St. Luke wrote under the authority of St. Paul, and St. Mark under that of St. Peter, and that so universally was this known in the early church that *there is not to be found in a single ancient writer the faintest trace of any doubt respecting the genuineness of any of the gospels*. What can we think of Dr. Walsh saying that the Holy Ghost gave his sanction to mere "hearsay"? How far is this from blasphemy? He tells us as another deduction from the value of the New Testament, that it was partly written to churches in different countries, partly to individuals, and was only partly "addressed to christians in general". But are not the spiritual wants of people in one country just the same as those of people in another country? And have we not seen that the sacred books were multiplied so fast and so widely that, even in St. Peter's day, the epistles of St. Paul were known in the churches at large? Moreover, does not the very fact that part of the New Testament was sent not to any one locality, but to christians every where, and that even the epistles sent to particular churches were addressed, (as the reader will see by examining their first verses) to all, without a shadow of restriction; are not these facts proof that the Bible was designed by the apostles not for a permitted few but for all? And would any part of Scripture be "addressed to christians in general" if it was not fitted to be generally and easily understood? As to the various parts of the New Testament "floating about the world for hundreds of years," it is sufficiently answered by Dr. Walsh's previous statement that "the confessors and martyrs endured all manner of torture, and resigned life itself rather than deliver into the hands of their pagan persecutors the precious copies of the inspired volume" (28). Now, as persecution may be said to have ceased A. D. 312, that is, little more than 20 years after the death of the apostle John, how could they have "floated about the world for hundreds of years" when martyrs and confessors had had "copies of the inspired volume," which comprised them, during the persecutions before this date, and died rather than give them up? The fact is, if not bound up as a whole, they were cherished in parts from the earliest times.

The Book of which the Archbishop has thus written is, he tells us, "the Bible," adding, what after such a caricature of it might be expected—that, in his opinion, it is "the most abstruse, the most difficult, the most mysterious volume that was ever published to the world." We are glad he acknowledges that it was "published to the world", and not to that part of the world to which he and his fellow-priests may please to give it. As to the proofs he has given of its abstruseness, &c., one is at a loss to know how most of them bear on the subject. The crowning evidence, for example, is that "not one autograph line of its various writers is now extant" or has been so for more than one thousand years. He has no autograph of most of the books of his library—does that make them more abstruse, &c.? But let one of his authorities, the Fathers, answer the charge. If he call for the opinions of others he can have them.—Says Chrysostom (that is the "golden mouthed," the name he got for his eloquence,) in urging the study of the Scriptures upon all:—"The grace of the Holy Spirit caused these books to be written by publicans, by tent-makers, by shepherds, by herdsmen, by unlettered persons, that no one might resort to this

pretext; that the contents of the Scriptures might be understood by all; that the mechanic, and the servant, and the widow, and the most ignorant of mankind might be profited by them. As the teachers of all ages, those holy writers who have been enlightened by the grace of the Holy Spirit have explained every thing in a *clear and distinct manner*, so that each may understand them without resorting to any other person. 'And I, brethren,' says St. Paul, 'came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom.' Take the Bible in thy hand; read it; remember carefully what thou hast understood; read over frequently that which seems obscure; if, after repeated study, thou dost not yet understand, ask a more enlightened brother or teacher. And should no man teach thee what thou seekest, God will explain it to thee in some way or other. Look at the Eunuch of the queen of the Ethiopians. He was reading in his chariot on a journey. There was nobody to explain what he was reading. God witnessed his zeal, and sent him a teacher. It is true there is no Philip here, but the Holy Spirit who inspired Philip is here." * Chrysostom lived A. D. 347-407. If there must be one word from Scripture out of so many in it, how could Timothy have known the holy Scriptures "*from his infancy*", and how could they "instruct" him "to salvation" (Douay version) if they be so abstruse, difficult and mysterious as Dr. Walsh asserts?

Dr. Walsh reproaches Protestants with having accepted the Scriptures at the hands of his church. The most he can make of it even if he persist in the assertion, is that we are indebted to Rome for them as the Jews were indebted to Babylon, on their return from captivity, for the sacred vessels of the Temple. We are charged with rejecting the Apocrypha without having "any authority to decide upon the Sacred Canon." It is surely strange if the authority which is sufficient to decide the genuineness of even human compositions—that of history, testimony and internal evidence should not be sufficient to settle that of the Scriptures. Can it be that God has left us with less proof of the genuineness of the different parts of His word than we have for even pagan writings?

In the 34th page, Dr. Walsh proceeds to turn his slanders on the Bible to account, by unblushingly exalting the church as a substitute which not only has none of its defects, but is absolutely perfect. He thrusts God into the background to bring forward the priesthood in His place. In order to do this with the more speciousness, he introduces Augustine as the model we should imitate, telling us very plainly that what he says so great a man as Augustine did, inferior men should surely be content to do. He should remember that God gave us the Bible, and not Augustine, for our guide. Five pages in one place (36 to 41) are devoted to a eulogium on the African Father and to extracts from some of his writings, the great drift of all being to shew that he believed in the claims of the Bishops of Rome to be the successors of St. Peter—that the Catholic Church was the only true church—that her teachings were free from error—and that, "without any scriptural rule of faith, nay before he believed in the inspiration of Scripture, before he credited the gospel itself as a divine

* Quoted in D'Aubigne's 'Voice of the Ancients,' 321.

compos
assertio
words o
"For
lic Chu
we acco
church
two pag
they are
mind th
that suc
zation—
only pro
the spre
conflict
christia
it had c
of the v
works b
particu
whatev
of its c
ry of A
assent t
Augu
I believ
subscri
force m
of Luke
that rul
join the
try to b
trustwo
ory wh
geon—
are forc
test the
we dou
time wr
the 'ch
he, "o
had sai
thou ha
Rock o
no man

* Ne

ed by all; that
 ignorant of man-
 whose holy writ-
 have explained
 understand them
 St. Paul, 'came
 in thy hand;
 ver frequently
 not yet under-
 no man teach
 or other. Look
 in his chariot
 ng. God wit-
 Philip here, but
 red A. D. 347-
 in it, how could
 and how could
 o abstruse, dif-

riptures at the
 sist in the as-
 re indebted to
 the Temple.
 any authority
 the authority
 positions—that
 cient to settle
 s proof of the
 r even pagan

the Bible to
 not only has
 to the back-
 do this with
 ould imitate,
 ine did, in-
 at God gave
 e place (36
 extracts from
 eved in the
 hat the Ca-
 re free from
 he believed
 as a divine

composition, he believed in the Holy Catholic Church." To support this last assertion he quotes a passage from one of Augustine's writings, the following words of which—printed by him in capitals—contain the pith of the whole:—"For I myself would not believe the gospel unless the authority of the Catholic Church had moved me to do so." This is Dr. Walsh's interpretation, and we accept it. That Augustine cherished the fancy of the outward unity of the church we all know. The question is, was it well founded? Dr. Walsh fills two pages with a statement of the reflections that led to his adopting it. But they are all pervaded with the fallacy which we might expect from one in whose mind the idea had been already fixed from childhood,—of taking it for granted that such an Institution already existed—a divinely appointed outward organization—the Visible Church—and of adopting, as proofs of its claims, what are only proofs of the truth and power of christianity. The fulfilment of prophecy, the spread of the truth in spite of the mightiest obstacles, its vitality amidst the conflict of error round it, which are only evidences of the heavenly origin of christianity, are taken as evidences, also, of the heavenly origin of the agency it had employed, which embodied itself to Augustine's mind in the conception of the Visible Church. The great truth is thus overlooked that christianity works by its own inherent energy, without any necessary connection with a particular outward medium—that its elixir is equally potent to bless through whatever channel it reaches us. But that any man held such a view is no proof of its correctness. The dogma of the Visible Church, and its connected theory of Apostolic succession must be established on sufficient grounds before our assent to them can be justly demanded.

Augustine had his wrong opinions as well as other men. Dr Walsh himself, I believe, would not endorse all his doctrines. I should like to know if he would subscribe that one by which he advocated the duty and right of persecution to force men to enter the church. Would Dr. Walsh agree to his interpretation of Luke xiv. v, 23, by which he argued that "compel them to come in" meant that rulers were authorized and bound to employ force, and compel men to join the communion of the Catholic Church? It would be well for the country to know Dr. Walsh's opinion on this point. But if no infallible or even trustworthy teacher in this particular, if, on the contrary, the founder of a theory which led ultimately to all the horrors of ecclesiastical despotism—the dungeon—the torture—the stake—he loses the prestige of oracular wisdom, and we are forced for self-protection in other matters also to examine his views, and test their intrinsic worth. Indeed, even in reference to the points in question, we doubt whether Dr. Walsh himself would assent to all that Augustine at any time wrote. He speaks thus in one place of one of the great texts on which the 'church' seeks to build her apostolic authority: "On this account," says he, "our Lord declares, 'on this rock I will found my church', because Peter had said: 'Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God', 'on this rock which thou hast confessed', he declares, 'I will build my church'; for Christ was the Rock on whose foundation Peter himself was built; for other foundation hath no man laid than that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus".* He thus founds

* Neander III., 224.

the church not on St. Peter, but directly on Christ. Hagenbach mentions a controversy which raged in the University of Louvain in 1567, in silencing which Pope Pius V. condemned, amongst other 'propositions, several which were taken literally from Augustine's writings.* A Roman Catholic edition of his works was published at Venice in 1584, in the title page of which it was proclaimed: "in which we have taken care that all those things should be removed which could infect the minds of the faithful with heretical error.† These facts, to which I might add others, certainly show that even in the 'church' every one does not receive every thing Augustine has written.

But, after all, was the church to which Augustine belonged the same as that which now calls itself the 'Catholic Church'? Mere succession of Bishops, supposing it could be proved, which very many learned men think impossible, would by no means establish its identity. Even if the same husk could be now shewn, it would be a poor substitute, in Augustine's eyes; for the kernel of doctrine, which, since his day, has grown so corrupt and rotten.

"The gospel" which Augustine says he received on the authority of the Catholic Church, Dr. Walsh defines to mean the 'divine composition' known by that name—that is the Scriptures. Taken in this sense, the whole that can be made of the words is, that he received as valid and sufficient the evidence presented by the known opinions of the first christians and of their children in the churches of his own day, and of the various christian writers who had lived before him, as to what books were to be received as inspired—whether, in short, the Bible as he then had it was, as Dr. Walsh says, a 'divine composition'.—This is just what every one does now who wishes to form a judgment on the same matter, or on other points capable of similar proof. That the sanction of all orthodox churches in his day was given to some books and withheld from others, that accumulated evidence was presented for some and none for others, was good ground for accepting the former and rejecting the latter.

We are told for our imitation that Augustine "believed in the Catholic Church" "before he believed in the inspiration of Scripture", and "without having any scriptural rule of Faith." The real truth is that belief in both the 'church' and the Scriptures was part of the faith of his childhood from which he could never entirely get free, even when abandoned as he long was to the dominion of vice and passion. From this depth of sin he was roused by nothing so much as the study of the word of God, which revived in his deadened heart the power of the creed he had learned from the lips of his mother. He was an intense student of St. Paul's epistles long before his baptism. It was to them a voice he fancied he heard from heaven directed him, when prostrate in agony on account of his sins. It told him with repeated command—TAKE, READ, and it was when, in obedience to this, he opened the Epistle to the Romans which he had with him in the garden where he was, that his eyes fell on the words that spoke peace to his soul. The reading of the Scriptures was the immediate means of Augustine's conversion. If he 'believed in the Catholic Church' before this, it was not the faith of a christian: if he believed in it af-

* Hagenbach II., 276.

† Gieseler's Eccl. Hist. I. 370.

each mentions a
77, in silencing
several which
Catholic edition
of which it was
should be re-
error. † These
the 'church' ev-

the same as that
of Bishops, sup-
think impossible,
could be now
kernel of doc-

city of the Ca-
non' known by
ole that can be
evidence pre-
children in the
had lived be-
ther, in short,
composition'.—
ement on the
he sanction of
withheld from
one for others,
r.

the Catholic
and "without
ef in both the
d from which
ng was to the
used by noth-
his deadened
mother. He
m. It was to
n prostrate in
TAKE, READ,
the Romans
es fell on the
s was the im-
the Catholic
eved in it af-

ter, he had already believed in the Bible. It is hard to see why Dr. Walsh should so greatly commend belief in the 'church' without the use of a 'scriptural rule of Faith' if the proofs in its support lie, as we might surely expect, on the surface of revelation. Why shrink from the Bible, and urge in its place testimony from other and certainly inferior sources? Proof from the 'sure word' of Scripture must be the strongest, as it is assuredly the most accessible. It must ever be difficult for men at large to study the line of evidence Dr. Walsh so urges on all from the alleged course of Augustine. The external evidences easily within reach in his day are not so in ours. They lie strawn over the face of antiquity—are unavailable for the mass—and, on many points, differently read even among the learned. Surely it is far better to go at once to the "pure well of undefiled revelation" which, even in the Dark Ages, was the "living source and fountain of *all* the knowledge" of the great and good. But the fact is, it would rest the claims of the church on the private judgment of his people as to the meaning of the texts alleged in its favour, if Dr. Walsh were to send them to the Bible as its authority, whereas if he get them to travel forth of the written word, they must blindly accept all the assertions of the church itself in its own favour.

That Augustine rendered such a puerile and implicit obedience to the 'authority' of the church, as she now demands, we scarcely think even Dr. Walsh will assert. If ever there was a man who thought out his system of religious belief for himself it was he. And as he acted in his own case he urged on others. He once and again shows how much he approved the use, by all, of their reason and reflection in matters of faith. He was the friend of the unrestricted study of the Bible. He invites Pagans who were inquiring after the truth, and sought a solution of the questions proposed to them in the Holy Scriptures, not so much to seek instruction from their spiritual guides, as to pray for light from above.* Among the characteristics of a zealous christian he places the following:—"He goes to church and listens to God's word; he returns home, finds a Bible there, and opens and reads it."† "Faith," says he, "will totter, if the authority of the Sacred Scriptures be shaken".‡ Very different this, from the language of Dr. Walsh.

One word as to his being "one of the greatest prodigies of learning" He was a profound thinker, we all know, but as to learning, it was the want of it that led him into many of his mistakes. He knew no Hebrew, and was but little acquainted with Greek, and was very deficient in the knowledge of the rules of the correct interpretation of Scripture, as may be judged from the instance I quoted on a former page.

Dr. Walsh deduces the following strange sentences from his quotations from Augustine. "It is certain then, and it cannot be denied that the church existed before the Bible; that the church was established, was fully organized, was furnished with every thing essential for the conversion of the world; it was administering the Sacraments, and preaching the gospel, and converting the Gen-

* Neander Ch. Hist. III. 377.

† Neander Ch. Hist. III. 379.

‡ Hagenbach Hist. Doct. I. 517.

tiles, and diffusing far and near the knowledge of saving faith, before a single line of the New Testament was written." This lengthy sentence is, throughout, a mere play upon words. The larger half of the Bible was completed for four hundred years before Christ came. As to the 'church' being organized &c. &c. &c." "before a single line of the New Testament was written", the assertion is mere dust for the eyes of a credulous reader. From the very beginning our Lord constantly recognized the written Word of God as the one divine and authoritative standard of faith and duty, and supported its claims by appeals to its contents. That the apostles constantly used it in the same way wherever it was known, is the concurrent testimony of a multitude of passages. They were "mighty in the Scriptures". Often we read such statements as the following—varying in language, identical in fact: "And Paul *according to his custom* went in unto them, and for three Sabbath days he reasoned with them out of the Scriptures", Acts xvii. 2. Douay Version. This was at Thessalonica, a city of Macedonia. Wherever the Scriptures were found, and they were scattered more or less in every country in synagogues and private families, we read that the first christian Teachers invariably appealed to them, "convincing", or "persuading", or "reasoning" from them in favour of the doctrines of Christ.

As to the want of the New Testament among the Gentiles we have already seen how early and widely book after book of it was sent abroad. But, besides this, it is to be remembered that the Apostles may be said to have *spoken* the New Testament day by day; for the testimony of early ecclesiastical history tells us—and with self-evident correctness—that it is in reality only an abstract of their constant teaching, put, under inspired guidance, in writing, that all ages might have a permanent and uncorrupted standard and epitome of the Truth. They 'delivered that which they received'. Yet men under the immediate and copious inspiration of the Holy Spirit—who only repeated through human lips the words of the Holy Ghost—they, forsooth, had no New Testament with them!

But it is further "certain that the Primitive christians of the first century, including even the apostles and disciples themselves, never saw, never heard, never read the whole Bible." As to the Primitive Christians, we have seen already how immediately the want was supplied, even though they had direct revelations from heaven from the lips of the apostles, and miraculous gifts of wisdom, teaching, prophecy, &c., to instruct and establish them, till the spread of the Scriptures made such an extraordinary state of things unnecessary. As to the apostles and disciples themselves never having seen the whole Bible, it is altogether terrible to hear an Archbishop speak thus of men to whom Christ once and again revealed himself in the midst of his dazzling glory, or, as in the case of Peter, by a voice calling him by name from out the canopy of heaven, or, as in the case of Paul, who was caught up to the third heaven itself and heard the unspeakable words of paradise.

The next certainty is that "many pagan nations were converted to christianity without the Bible." We suppose our Micmacs are an example, or that

case
tism
er, w
cruci
they,
ed an
tells
so co
woul
are n
the w
we h
of the
the J
of Jo
the p
such
An

Faith
made
turn
this v
that
to the
as in
to the
word
shall
Law,
Dives
Luke
peal
15-1
and a
Old
faith,
not b
of doc

Dr.
sacred
from
sumes
and d
time t

* R

case mentioned by Seymour,* when a friend of his was present at the baptism of a whole settlement of Indians. "They were marched down to a river, where the missionary waited for them; he baptized them all, hung a little crucifix round the neck of each, told them that now they were christians, and they, pleased at the pretty ornament they received, marched back, as instructed and as wise, as naked and as savage, as they came!" Dr. Walsh further tells us that "it is impossible to shew any one idolatrous country that has been so converted by the Bible alone". In the case of most "idolatrous nations" it would be very strange if they had been. Pagans without a written language are not likely to profit by the Bible—in such cases it does its work as soon as the way for it is opened. But in countries like China, where reading exists, we hear the most happy accounts of the spread of the truth by the circulation of the word of God. He forgets that the two great revivals of religion among the Jews, when they turned from their idolatry or gross declensions, in the days of Josiah and Ezra, were the direct results of the reading of the Scriptures, the previous neglect of which, in the manner he would recommend, had led to such universal apostasy and corruption.

Another certainty of Dr. Walsh is that "if the Bible were the only Rule of Faith appointed by God he would have revealed this essential doctrine, and made known in the clearest manner this cardinal point." We might surely turn the sentence against him and say that, if the Bible were *not* the only Rule this would be the case. There are few doctrines more clearly revealed than that of the Protestant world on this point. The Old Testament writers appeal to the "Law and the Testimony" as the only Divine and authoritative Rule, as in Isaiah viii. 20, and elsewhere. Christ, as we have seen, refers the Jews to the Scriptures for the proof of his claims. He himself tells us that "His word is to judge us at the last day," John xii. 48; and to the question, "What shall I do that I may possess eternal life?" He answers, "What is written in the Law, how readest thou?" Luke x. 25, 26. Abraham refers the brethren of Dives to Moses and the Prophets only, in order to secure their salvation, Luke xvi. 29. "What saith the Scriptures?" is the final and conclusive appeal of the evangelists and apostles. St. Paul tells us (Douay vn. 2 Tim. iii. 15-17.) that the Holy Scriptures can "instruct" the believer "to salvation," and are given that the "man of God may be perfect;" and surely if even the Old Testament Scriptures were thus sufficient, not only to form and direct our faith, so as to secure salvation, but to make us "perfect," the whole Bible cannot be less so now that the New Testament also is given. On how many points of doctrine is revelation more clear and explicit than here?

Dr. Walsh tells us that, so far from attaching much importance to his own sacred and blessed Word, God has "no where declared that Faith was to come from the dead letter of books;" (it is thus a Roman Catholic Archbishop presumes to speak of the 'Word of Life') "but from the living voice of apostles and doctors." If the teachers of Christianity should be called 'doctors' every time they are mentioned in the New Testament, it would make strange read-

* Rev. M. H. Seymour, M. A. Christ. Assoc. Lectures, 1850, page 235.

ing. "It is certain that 'Faith cometh from *hearing*' according to the Scriptures; but it is not said that Faith cometh from *reading*." Not in these very words, Archbishop, but is it not implied and expressed in as clear words, once and again? What can we make of the passages I have just quoted from Timothy? But let me add one or two more that we may see the full worth of this pitiful catch. I do so from the Douay Bible. "The Law of the Lord is unspotted" says David, "converting souls" Psalm 'xviii. 8. "These are *written that ye may believe* that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name. John xx. 31.

If what he has thus written be not sufficient to lead people to believe, what can we say of St. John who asserts that he wrote it expressly that they should? "Blessed is he that *readeth* and *heareth* the words of this prophecy," &c.; Rev. i. 3 This is the Douay version. The original Greek is literally "Blessed is he that *readeth*, and they that *hear*," &c. Take the words as they stand, ask yourselves what you would have meant by them if you had been in the position to use them. It is remarkable that this sentence stands at the beginning of the most difficult portion of Scripture. Many passages of a similar strain I have not room to adduce.

Dr. Walsh, in order to prove still more conclusively that we are to look only to the "Church," next brings forward a strange argument. "The greater part of mankind cannot read"; says he, "for fifteen centuries after the establishment of the Church (the church again put first) not one in a thousand was able to read, and not one in 20 or 50,000 could get a copy of the whole Bible." * * * Was God "more indifferent to the salvation of his creatures" before printing than he has been since?" or would he deprive the poor of "any essential spiritual help and give the rich and the learned all those necessary advantages which unlettered poverty could not help to share? No; dearly beloved Brethren, our merciful Redeemer has not acted in *this preposterous manner*." The italics are ours. Have a care, Archbishop, lest you sin and "speak a foolish thing against God." Suppose you were wrong, what fearful language is this to use respecting your Maker. And can we always tell what God will do from our ideas of what so good and gracious a Being should do? Then God would no longer dwell in the thick darkness. We could foretell his policy at all times. Then would the high mysteries of his government—those clouds of dark and awful state which hang round his pavilion be dissipated for ever, and man would "comprehend the steps of God and find out the Almighty perfectly."—O Archbishop, "He is higher than heaven, and what wilt thou do? He is deeper than hell, and how wilt thou know? The measure of him is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea. If he shall overturn all things and press them together who shall contradict him?"

But is there nothing in the moral government of God which we cannot understand? What shall we make of the existence of evil at all under the reign of a God of Love? "Was God more indifferent," we might ask, in Dr. Walsh's own words, "to the salvation of his creatures" before Christ's coming than since? Yet he left the world at large through its broad continents and myriad islands in heathen darkness for thousands of years, and a revelation was given

ling to the Scrip-
Not in these very
clear words, once
st quoted from Ti-
the full worth of
Law of the Lord is
viii. 8. "These
the Son of God;
1.

e to believe, what
y that they should?
phecy," &c.; Rev.
erally "Blessed is
as they stand, ask
been in the posi-
at the beginning
a similar strain I

ve are to look only
"The greater part
r the establishment
usand was able to
ole Bible." * * *
s" before printing
any essential spi-
essary advantages
; dearly beloved
posterior manner."
and "speak a fool-
ful language is this
t God will do from
Then God would
policy at all times,
clouds of dark and
or ever, and man
ghty perfectly,"—
thou do? He is
re of him is longer
urn all things and

ich we cannot un-
all under the reign
ask, in Dr. Walsh's
rist's coming than
inents and myriad
velation was given

only to a small tribe in Canaan. Does this prove that the Gospel is, therefore, no "essential spiritual help?" Or that we would be just as well without it?—Christ came to seek and to save the lost of all nations—the ends of the earth are to look unto him and be saved. But to this day the swarming populations of many tribes, and peoples and tongues, have never heard his blessed name. Are they, then, deprived of no "essential spiritual help" in the want of the gospel—a help which we—the 'rich' and the 'learned' in comparison with them, have so long enjoyed? Does their not having heard the news of salvation through Jesus show that they do not need to hear it, and are equally well without it? Apply this reasoning to the case of the Bible.

But the Archbishop is, as usual, only trying to pass off a sophism for a sound argument. We do not say that it is "essential" to "salvation" that a man should be able to *read*. Far from it. There are multitudes of the unlettered poor in glory, and they were admitted there as freely if they had believed in Christ from *hearing*, as if they had done so from reading. Heaven is open to all alike who wash their robes and make them white in the Blood of the Lamb. The Archbishop, therefore, attributes that to us which we do not in the remotest way hold, and hence his argument is of no worth and falls pointlessly to the ground. But, on the other hand, is the conclusion he draws from the fact that a man may be saved without being able to read,—in any way just—that therefore the Bible is of no value, or of little to those who can read? Assuredly not. We are to add to our faith 'knowledge.'

Dr. Walsh tells us that God has not acted in such a "preposterous manner" as to hinge the spiritual benefit of his people to any degree on his word. If he had spoken only of the *reading* of the Bible, and pointed us to the *hearing* it read or expounded, as the source of religious health and growth, it would have been only a partial injury or error. But, instead of this, he puts aside the Bible altogether, and substitutes for it the "church". Through three pages and a half he expatiates on the glory and design of this 'Blessed Kingdom' without once mentioning the Scriptures. They are, in fact, completely ignored.—There is no need of them. The 'church' does and provides everything necessary. Obedience to her commands is alone required. Thus is the sun of God's word sought to be plucked from its place, and the world left to grope by ecclesiastical candles. But, thank God, it shines, and will still shine, till it fill a cloudless sky with its light, and the wide landscape be bathed in its living splendour.

It would be well if Dr. Walsh would show how such a verse as "He that hears you hears me, and he that despises you despises me," applies any more to a Roman Catholic than to a Protestant clergyman who preaches Christ faithfully. In either case Christ is despised if his office of mercy clearly and faithfully stated is rejected. He is heard if his offer be accepted.

Having descanted on the blessings held out by the church, Dr. Walsh proceeds to tell us what she expects from our hands in return. The first moderate item is that we acknowledge her as "the great living authority, which, in spiritual things, all mankind are bound to obey," and as "the guardian and interpreter of the Law of God." That she is divinely appointed to be so is as

usual, taken for granted, without any further proof than the bare assertion; having made which he hastens to justify her monopoly by stating some of the grounds on which she refuses the world the liberty to "expound" the book that has been sent to it. "It was not," says he, "the mode in which Christ instructed her to evangelize the world?" Can we deduce a momentous doctrine from what Christ did *not* say? Surely His will is more clearly seen from the way in which it was understood and acted on by his inspired apostles. Yet they "reasoned" and "disputed" with the Jews out of the Scriptures, and commended the Bereans, as even my motto tells us, for searching these sacred writings to judge for themselves respecting the things they were told. But, further, the church knows by 'Divine instinct' (not, certainly, by the Divine Word) that "if such a practice were permitted there would be neither the 'unity of the spirit,' nor the 'bond of peace.'" Did not the apostles, then, desire both, as much as the church can or does, when they commended the Bereans for this very 'practice,' or wrote to the Thessalonians to "Prove all things: hold fast that which is good." (Douay vn 1 Thess. v. 7.) In what does real unity consist? Does a family in order to enjoy it, and to have cast round their happy circle the 'bond of peace,' need to be in every particular of exactly the same opinion?

It is Paul who tells the Roman Christians, when they were making points of conscience about clean and unclean meats, and holy and common days, and striving to get a dead uniformity introduced—that they should each do as he thought was his duty and not judge his brother, for 'the kingdom of God was not in meats and drinks; but justice and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.'—(Douay vn. Rom. xiv.) The former were things indifferent—the latter made the Unity of the church or 'kingdom of God.'

Again, the "unlearned and unstable would pervert the Scriptures to their own destruction". But why go further than St. Peter himself? He does not breathe a word about withholding them on this account. It is even clear from the very words he uses that the sacred writings, including those of St. Paul, were in the hands of the people at large, else how could they pervert them?—Nothing is said about an infallible interpreter of any kind. Nor is it of men in general he speaks, but only of the 'ignorant' and 'unstable,' and, surely, when it is not enjoined or even recommended to withhold the Scriptures even from them, it is not just, on account of their mistakes or abuses, to take it from all. The best way to prevent error is not to perpetuate ignorance, but to remove it, and the most effectual means of securing the truth from the crude and changeable fancies of the 'unstable' is to diffuse correct views of its meaning.

Dr. Walsh's next proof is from the words, "no prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation." But why establish a great doctrine on a text which has been more variously understood than almost any other?—As quoted by him, from the Douay version, it seems to speak of the 'making' of prophecy at first by the prophets themselves, not our use of it after, and to mean that what they revealed was not 'made' or disclosed by their own power in finding out what was future—not by their 'private interpretation' of what was to come, but that they spake only 'as they were moved by the Holy Ghost'

—prop
that D
sion m
is any
ed to g
even
line of
with re
whisper
even of
ful in
confide

ture.

Church

As h
the Bil
with.

"all th

ing tru

astound

"it wa

mankin

ceeds

says h

presen

of a re

Walsh

God th

phet.

write t

(Isaiah

phetic

raised

of the

self, (I

and pr

time w

under

Walsh

written

pensat

which

teachi

of the

ous tru

by the

—prophecy thus not coming 'by the will of man.' At the best to what does all that Dr. Walsh can draw from these words amount? Whatever the expression mean it is confined to prophecy: it does not embrace the whole Bible, nor is any thing said of the church or any other party being empowered or appointed to give an authoritative interpretation of any part of it. Such a thing is not even hinted. Nothing is said about restricting any from the study of even a line of it—nothing to discourage the freest access to it of all. A fact is stated with respect to the 'making' of the prophecies, but it is accompanied by no whisper of denial to any of the right to seek for themselves an explanation even of them. We are told what should make us at once humble and prayerful in opening the Sacred Oracles, and should restrain us from presumptuous confidence in our views of the purport of that of which the fulfilment is still future. But we are told nothing more, and even this is addressed as much to the Church itself as to the private Christian.

As he draws nearer his close Dr. Walsh waxes still bolder. He now gives the Bible the final coup de grace. It may be sent to the trunkmaker's forthwith. He tells us that even if there had never been a New Testament, or if "all that has been written had perished," the church could 'still teach the saving truths of salvation, and securely guide her children to eternal life.' This astounding announcement he endeavours to make probable by telling us that "it was not by writing that the truths of Revelation were first made known to mankind, either under the Old or New Covenant," an assertion which he proceeds to sustain by quoting a series of illustrative proofs. "The Almighty," says he, "*spoke to man in Paradise!*" as if he could argue from Eden to the present, and from the communion of a holy creature with his Maker to the case of a revolted and sinful race! Next "*He spoke through the Prophets.*" Dr. Walsh surely forgets the common Hebrew phrase respecting revelations from God through these holy men. It is that he spoke "by the hand of" the prophet. He omits to tell us how often such expressions occur as "the Lord said *write the Vision*"—"the Lord said take thee a great book and write in it."—(Isaiah viii. 1, Hab. ii. 2.) He forgets how great a part of the Scripture is prophetic, and that, besides what they wrote, during all the period in which God raised up the prophets, there was a written Law—a portion of which consisted of the Tables of Testimony written on both sides by the Finger of God Himself, (Exod. xxxii. 15) and that this law was the High and only Rule of Faith and practice. As to God's "speaking by his Son" we have seen how little time was allowed to pass before what was thus spoken was embodied in writing under the direction of the Holy Spirit, to keep it from being corrupted. Dr. Walsh tells us that for "2400 years", from Adam to Moses, there "was no written revelation." But does he know all the details of the patriarchal dispensation? If he do, no man else does. Still as he claims it as a period in which "the will of God was made known" through "oral tradition and oral teaching" alone, we will give him the benefit of it as affording a striking proof of the worth of these highly extolled means of preserving and spreading religious truths. It would have been better for the boast of the church being able by their means alone, without any sacred writings whatever, as he maintains, to

transmit the truth to all ages in all its integrity, if he had let this illustration alone, for we find that the first half of these palmy days of 'oral tradition' and 'oral teaching' ended by leaving no more religion in the world than was found in the Ark, and that the second exhibits almost as great a corruption, when well nigh the only godliness left was found in the household of Abraham.

Dr Walsh tells us that under the Mosaic dispensation, the "sole means" for "determining the true doctrine, or deciding religious disputes" was the "authority of the Jewish Priesthood and the Jewish Church", and, in support of this extraordinary assertion, quotes, as an 'evident' proof of its correctness, our Lord's saying, "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in the chair of Moses, according to what they say to you do ye: but according to their works do ye not".—Unfortunately for the sense Dr. Walsh draws from these words, we have an indisputable statement of their meaning from Christ himself, who, so far from inculcating on the people a blind and implicit obedience, or investing even the Pharisees with 'authority' in matters of faith, expressly tells his disciples to "take heed and beware of their doctrine" (Matt. xvi. 6. 12.); denounces them as 'blind guides', and affirms that they made their proselytes "children of Hell". Still more—he speaks thus of their "oral tradition", so lauded by Dr. Walsh, which was a great part of their teaching: "Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God for your tradition—you have made void the commandment of God for your tradition. Hypocrites! * * in vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines and commandments of men"! (Matt. xv. Dy. vn). Now is it conceivable that Christ would enjoin the people to obey them in those things in which they made "void" and "transgressed" the "commandment of God", and their worship was "vain" from their "teaching doctrines and commandments of men"? Would he require them implicitly to follow "blind guides", or to listen to all they said, and so be made "children of Hell"? Far be it from us ever to cast such an imputation on our blessed Lord. The quotation of Dr. Walsh, then, amounts only to this, that, as public teachers of the Law, and as much of their instruction, notwithstanding all their corruptions, was in harmony with it, Jesus desired to uphold them so far as they kept by its precepts. When they transgressed: it or 'made' it 'void', the command was—"Take heed and beware of their doctrine". Will Dr. Walsh allow his people the same liberty to try his 'doctrines' by Scripture? It is not the case that "the Jewish Church and Priesthood" were the authoritative interpreters of the Scriptures in any sense like that claimed by the Church of Rome. Neither the Priests nor any other class laid claim to the right of exclusive or authoritative interpretation, as Dr. Walsh would have us believe. Jesus 'preached' and 'taught in the synagogues'. Yet assuredly he did not give the interpretations of the 'Jewish Church and Priesthood'; nor, certainly, did his apostles, and yet they, also, as we see in the book of Acts, had the synagogues freely open to them. The fact is, that any person who was thought to be able, was at liberty to read or to preach, especially, among others, one who appeared in the character of the head or leader of a new sect, probably that the audience might be fairly informed of their principles, and not condemn them unheard or unknown.

Dr.
exclus
economi
ence o
religio
in each
what l
he om
ons of
of pain
simple
if it ca
Now,
nected
pelling
what i
a tyrann
main f
God.
church
vice—
Now
so who
He wo
end?
faith v
the bo
The o
ment
We
ply as
is that
Rome.
ficient.
to us v
private
'author
comm
rity' h
it amo
touch
mind.
The
sound,
power
with t
child t
should
"Sailo
--blind
accepti
silent—
the sou
What
"Soldi
does it
mind b
eviden
of the

is illustration
tradition" and
man was found
caption, when
raham.

e means" for
was the "au-
in support of
correctness, our
loses, accord-

do ye not".—
e have an in-
o far from in-
ng even the
disciples to
nounces them
children of

ded by Dr.
no transgress
oid the com-
do they wor-
xv. Dy. vn).

hem in those
commandment
doctrines and
allow "blind
Hell"? Far

The quotat-
chers of the
rptions, was
ot by its pre-
mand was—
v his people
the case that

reeters of the
ne. Neith-
re or autho-
"preached"

interpreta-
his apostles,
s freely op-
ble, was at
ared in the
ience might
ard or un-

Dr. Walsh next endeavours to show the necessity for an authoritative and exclusive interpretation of the Scriptures by the 'church', under the christian economy. He tells us that "authority" is essential to the stability and existence of all human government, and, hence, must be necessary in the things of religion. "If the subject were permitted", says he, "to take the code of laws in each country, and interpret them according to his own judgment or inclination, what law would be ever obeyed, or what legal dispute would be ever settled"? But he omits in this question a most important particular. The opinions or decisions of courts owe all their 'authority' to their being enforced by a background of pains and penalties. Without these they would sink from 'authority' to simple advice. And so it must be in all other 'authority'. It ceases to be so if it cannot enforce its decisions. It comes, as I have said, to be mere advice. Now, has the church any power to carry out its decrees on a single point connected with man's belief? Most assuredly not. Man has no means of compelling the mind to receive an opinion. He has no power to force it to reject what it feels to be true. "You may sew up my mouth," said a philosopher to a tyrant, "shut me up, load me with chains; but my soul is free and will remain free". The only power to which such language cannot be used is that of God. Authority over the soul belongs to Him alone. The 'authority' of the church, then, or of any body of men in matters of faith, is, after all, only advice—it is like the decree of a court which has no power to enforce obedience.

Now can it be supposed that God would ever invest the church with what is so wholly nominal; that He would put such a reed in its hands for a sceptre; that He would establish an 'authority' which was wholly powerless to secure its end? Again, assuredly not. There is an 'authoritative interpretation' of faith which is no illusion. It is that which is given when the Throne is set and the books are opened, and every man shall give account of himself to God.—The only jurisdiction over the human soul that is not a mockery is the Judgment Seat.

We answer Dr. Walsh's claim of 'authority' for his church, therefore, by simply asserting its impossibility. The only power man can exert over the mind is that of persuasion, which is the very reverse of that 'authority' demanded by Rome. If convincing arguments are advanced for a point, these alone are sufficient, and the 'authority' of the church is not needed. If the arguments seem to us weak, we remain where we were, and the priest is in the position of any private man who has failed for want of new proofs. What can the church's 'authority' do after this? Can it compel belief? A man cannot believe by command any more than he can love by command. There is, then, no 'authority' here. And if, as the last resort, the use of force is employed, to what does it amount? Can the bars of a prison convince? Can the rack or the stake touch the soul? There is, then, here, finally, no human 'authority' over the mind.

The 'church' knows that there is not—that the name is only an illusion—a sound, and hence seeks to gain her end by an indirect means. Feeling she is powerless if reasons be asked, she bends all her efforts to get men to dispense with them altogether. She strives to get her doctrines taken in the lump as a child takes Bluebeard. Even Dr. Walsh draws his model of the obedience that should be rendered, from that of the "Soldier" to the "Articles of War", or the "Sailor" to the "Naval Code". As the "first duty of a Soldier is obedience"—blind, dumb, machine-like, obedience, so he would have that of the mind in accepting its opinions and its faith. The first duty of a Soldier is that he be silent—asking no questions—doing as he is ordered; and so the first duty of the soul is to be silent, ask no questions, but believe what the church commands. What kind of belief can that be which is rendered as the "obedience" of a "Soldier" is to "Articles" enforced by the lash and the halter? If yielded, does it prove the 'authority' of the church over the mind? It does not, for the mind has not been consulted, it has stood altogether aside in the matter. The evidence that it has, shines out in the fact, that, if it awake to think, the doubt of the humblest and hitherto most implicit believer can only be removed by

presenting reason on reason till he be satisfied. To speak of 'authority', then, in matters of faith, is only to cheat us by words. It is simply impossible, and the only substitute the church can find is to habituate the mind to silence—to train it to dispense with reasons altogether, and perpetuate the credulity of childhood.

Notwithstanding this, Dr. Walsh ominously commends the church, for having, as he says, "proscribed the heretics of every age and country". If it be impossible, as we have seen it is, from the very nature of the mind, to believe, except on conviction, how deadly the wrong to "proscribe" men for what their convictions have forced upon them? How utterly wrong must it be to maintain in the church itself a system which only makes men Catholics by making them less than men? Dr. Walsh approves of "proscribing heretics"!!

One thing in connection with the asserted 'authority' of the church is much to be noticed. If we ask the grounds on which it is claimed, Dr. Walsh must refer us to the Scriptures for proof. He cannot refuse to do so, but must quote passages, in which, in his opinion, the doctrine is maintained. But, before it can be received as well founded and binding, each inquirer must judge the meaning of these for himself. Nor can it be permitted that the church should affix any authoritative interpretation to them beforehand, for her right and ability to do so, either with them or any other part of Scripture, is the very point to be proved, and can be acknowledged at all only after their correct meaning is otherwise ascertained. Until this is done, she stands in exactly the same position at the bar of the private judgment of each inquirer, as the claimant of a worldly dignity or privilege does at the bar of the constituted tribunals of the land. Thus she has to submit to this much abused right of the human mind to receive its belief only when convinced by satisfactory reasons, as the sole means of establishing her claims at all. We must use our private judgment to ascertain her title to demand of us not to use it! Surely if it be competent to decide on a fundamental like this, it is competent to decide on the simple statements of the plan of salvation. If the church must be built on the convictions of mankind, what pretence can there be for underrating their value as a means of deciding truth? Dr. Walsh must beware of speaking lightly of the justness and necessity of his people weighing the reasons advanced for their faith, else he honeycombs the foundation of the church itself.

Dr. Walsh tells us of the evil effects on "society at large", of "the general liberty to examine and study the Bible. Yet, including all the scandal and 'turbulence', and 'immorality', &c., of which one can think in Protestant countries, whether, on the whole, are they, or those in which Popery flourishes, most peaceful, and prosperous, and intelligent? "Throughout Christendom", says Macaulay, speaking of the Church of Rome since the Reformation, "whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been made in spite of her, and has everywhere been in inverse proportion to her power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces in Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and in intellectual torpor, while Protestant countries once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned, by skill and industry, into gardens, and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. Whoever, knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what four hundred years ago they actually were, shall now compare the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of Papal domination." * * * Whoever passes in Germany from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality; in Switzerland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant Canton, finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilization". *

Dr. Walsh even as he draws to a close has another thrust at the Bible. On

* Hist. of England, Vol. i. 48.

page
note
ars,
differ
give
saying
not o
zeal t
Let h
As
denec
fed b
nent
ed?
of the
to ha
the an
said t
have
ry me
of the
the b
we m
casion
that,
God's
which
then,
Wals
part
rects
all th
that c
So of
to you
to you
he wa
the O
the S
pages
He
Chris
privat
tures,
the an
ings c
ed ou
word
they
matte
they
shoul
Dr
he sa
restric

page 46, he actually tells us 'that a great portion of it is lost', and has a long note in the appendix to support this assertion. "Some learned Biblical scholars," he tells us, "are of opinion, and not without reason, that about twenty different books of Scripture have been entirely lost". It is a pity he did not give us the names of this mysterious "some". He certainly was right in not saying "many". But the attempt thus to throw suspicion on the Scriptures is not original: in this, also, he but follows in the footsteps of others who, in their zeal to exalt the church, would degrade and discredit even these holy oracles. Let him, if he can, produce the "reasons" which justify the "opinion".

As to the books quoted as named in the Bible and not now extant, what evidence has he that they were inspired, or, if inspired, that they were not dictated by God for a temporary purpose, without being designed for the permanent use of his people? Paul quotes from the Greek poets: were they inspired? Had the Jews no books except those of the Scriptures? Some at least of the writings Dr. Walsh names were merely secular compositions—one seems to have been a collection of popular songs, and another a mere muster roll of the army. The proverbs and canticles of Solomon to which he refers are only said to have been *spoken*, not written. And, if they were written, what proof have we that they were inspired any more than his treatises on Natural History mentioned in Scripture, or the royal documents of his government? Others of these so called 'lost books' are thought to be only different names for some of the books of our present Bible. And if the names of prophets be mentioned, we must bear in mind that these holy men were only inspired on especial occasions, and that, hence, all even they wrote was not necessarily canonical; and that, as I have stated above, they were doubtless often inspired to convey God's will on subjects of local and passing importance, the communications of which the Holy Spirit may not have seen it necessary to preserve. Before, then, he can with any justice speak of books of the Scriptures being lost, Dr. Walsh would require to prove that it was ever God's design they should be part of the Bible at all. Of the New Testament Dr. Walsh says "St. Paul directs the Colossians (iv. 16) to read the Epistle of the Laodiceans." But almost all the best commentators suppose that this epistle was only another copy of that of the Ephesians which was in a measure a circular letter to the churches.* So of the words "and in the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians Paul says 'I wrote to you in an epistle.'" The literal meaning of the original is "I have written to you in the Epistle," or "in this Epistle"—that is, in the former part of the one he was then writing. As to the "two quotations given by St. Matthew from the Old Testament (Matt. ii. 23, xxvii. 9) which are not now to be found in the Scriptures," all that is needed to expose the pitiful catch is to turn to the pages of any popular commentary.

He next gives us a list of Apocryphal books and a few writings of ancient Christian authors to try to perplex the simple by asking respecting them, how private individuals at this day can know whether they, as well as the Scriptures, should not be received as inspired. Some he names were esteemed by the ancient church as at once impious and absurd. Some were even the writings of heretics. None were received as canonical. Yet here they are, dragged out from obscurity, to drive away "the unlearned and unstable" from the word of God! "How any private individual can know at this day whether they were not inspired" may be easily answered. If they have doubts on the matter any Protestant clergymen will give or procure them the information they need from historical proof. Meanwhile, that so many of various opinions should agree in rejecting these writings is sufficient to satisfy most.

Dr. Walsh boasts of the 'vast number of editions' of the Douay Bible which he says have been published, as a proof that the Church of Rome, with proper restrictions, 'earnestly recommends the devout reading of the Scriptures.' He

* Bloomfield's Gk. Test. ii. 323.

forgets that, wherever the English language is spoken, the presence of Protestants forces his church to provide a version of the Scriptures for her people.—Her true feeling regarding the sacred volume can be only seen in Roman Catholic countries, and in these the case is widely different. At this moment there lie in the common jail of Florence, condemned, the one to 54, the other to 46 months imprisonment, *with hard labour*, an inoffensive man and woman—the Madiais—charged with no crime but that of reading the Scriptures together in their own dwelling. Count Guicciardini is now in exile from Tuscany for daring to read, in company with six of his countrymen, the Gospel according to St. John. Many in different parts of Italy now pine in the dungeon for similar offences. In the heart of Italy, at this day, says the Times, “men are forced to gain access to the Bible, and to the offices of Christianity, with as much secrecy and peril as the early Christians”. Of the condition of the city of Rome itself as regards the Scriptures, the following is the statement of a learned, candid, and able clergyman of the Church of England:—“The ignorance of the population of Italy, both ecclesiastics and laics, respecting the Holy Scriptures is complete and total. I had heard from one who had resided ten years at Rome, that one copy of the Sacred Volume in the language of the people could not be procured, unless in secret, in any bookselling establishment at Rome. The surprise and incredulity with which I heard this statement, determined me to test it, and to judge for myself respecting what appeared so strange an exaggeration. I soon ascertained the address of every such establishment in the city, and commenced my tour of research. I visited in person every shop, and in every shop was informed that they had no copy of the Holy Scriptures in the language of the people.”

“I asked on every occasion, why they did not possess so important a book, and on every occasion they replied, ‘it is not permitted,’ or ‘it is prohibited.’ The result was the fullest confirmation of the statement which was made to me; for I could not obtain a portable copy in the establishment of any bookseller in Rome. I found two copies of Martini’s edition in 24 volumes, capable of being bound in eight or ten volumes, and at the cost of 105 francs, or about £4 sterling, equal relatively to £6 in this country (Britain). Under this price so truly prohibitive, the volume could not be procured, and on suggesting the importation of a cheap and portable edition, the various booksellers stated that the prohibition was designed against the sale of the Holy Scriptures in any cheap or portable form, the object being to prevent their circulation.* Nor are other countries better than Rome where the ‘church,’ is supreme. In Spain, for example, Borrow tells us that not one in five hundred is aware that there is such a book as the New Testament in existence.† In Portugal two thirds of the people do not know the Scriptures even by name.‡ So much for the church’s “earnestly recommending the devout reading” of the Bible.

But what need of further proof have we of the positive hostility of Rome to the circulation of this blessed book than the way in which Dr Walsh traduces it? Would any friend of the Bible speak of it in such a manner? Would any one speak so of even a *human* book he respected? What sense of its importance can he possibly have?

In conclusion, we fear that, notwithstanding all he has said in defence of his system, the accusations Dr. Walsh set out to refute, only come back on him with redoubled force. One thing his Pastoral shows very clearly: how Rome varies in her practices and polity in different countries—in Protestant nations affecting ultra liberalism, and desire for progress of all kinds; in communities where she is not led by competition to dissimulate, sitting wrinkled and hateful, the very genius of ignorance and corruption.

*Seymour’s Pilgrimage to Rome, 220.

†Bible in Spain, 16.

‡Bible in Spain, 90.

